

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
WESTERN DISTRICT OF MICHIGAN  
SOUTHERN DIVISION

TALIA SIMPSON-CHURCHWELL,

Plaintiff,

v.

COMMISSIONER OF  
SOCIAL SECURITY,

Defendant.

CASE No. 1:23-CV-971

HON. ROBERT J. JONKER

**ORDER APPROVING AND ADOPTING  
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION**

The Court has reviewed Magistrate Judge Green’s Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 17); Plaintiff’s Objection to the Report and Recommendation (ECF No. 18) and the Commissioner’s Response (ECF No. 19). Under the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure, where, as here, a party has objected to portions of a Report and Recommendation, “[t]he district judge . . . has a duty to reject the magistrate judge’s recommendation unless, on de novo reconsideration, he or she finds it justified.” 12 WRIGHT, MILLER, & MARCUS, FEDERAL PRACTICE AND PROCEDURE § 3070.2, at 381 (2d ed. 1997). Specifically, the Rules provide that:

The district judge must determine de novo any part of the magistrate judge’s disposition that has been properly objected to. The district judge may accept, reject, or modify the recommended disposition; receive further evidence; or return the matter to the magistrate judge with instructions.

FED R. CIV. P. 72(b)(3). De novo review in these circumstances requires at least a review of the evidence before the Magistrate Judge. *Hill v. Duriron Co.*, 656 F.2d 1208, 1215 (6th Cir. 1981). The Court has reviewed de novo the claims and evidence presented to the Magistrate Judge; the

Report and Recommendation itself; and Plaintiff's objections. After its review, the Court finds the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation is factually sound and legally correct.

The Magistrate Judge recommends affirming the Commissioner's decision. In the objections, Plaintiff primarily reiterates and expands upon arguments presented in the original brief.<sup>1</sup> The objections fail to deal in a meaningful way with the Magistrate Judge's analysis. The Magistrate Judge carefully and thoroughly considered the record, the parties' arguments, and the governing law. The Magistrate Judge properly analyzed Plaintiff's claims. The Court determines the Commissioner's decision should be affirmed for the very reasons articulated in the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation.

**ACCORDINGLY, IT IS ORDERED** that the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (ECF No. 17) is **APPROVED AND ADOPTED** as the opinion of the Court.

**IT IS FURTHER ORDERED** that the Commissioner's decision is **AFFIRMED**. A separate Judgment shall issue.

Dated: August 21, 2024

/s/ Robert J. Jonker  
ROBERT J. JONKER  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup> As the Commissioner points out, Plaintiff has also raised arguments for the first time that were not presented in the initial brief. Sandbagging is generally not permitted. Plaintiff's perfunctory argument raised in the first time in the Objections fails to convince the Court there is any error in the ALJ's reasoning.